

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,762	10/31/2001	Rainer Treptow	DT-6016	4302
	590 11/30/2004		EXAMINER	
DAVID TOREN, ESQ. SIDLEY, AUSTIN, BROWN & WOOD, LLP			HANDY, DWAYNE K	
787 SEVENTH		LLF	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK,	NY 10019-6018	•	1743	
			DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
	10/001,762	TREPTOW, RAINER	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dwayne K Handy	1743	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory i - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a loon. c, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOS statute. Cause the application to become AB.	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communic	cation.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	02 September 2004.		
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all	lowance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merit	s is
closed in accordance with the practice un	der <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>47,48 and 51-66</u> is/are pending i	n the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>65</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>47,48,51-56,58-64 and 66</u> is/are	rejected.		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>57</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	prrection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	1(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		oplication No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have been r	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bu	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceived.	•
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)) Paper No(s),	ımmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09022004</u>. 	3/08) 5) Notice of Info	ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
S. Patent and Trademark Office	6) Other:	<u>-</u> -	

Application/Control Number: 10/001,762

Art Unit: 1743

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 2. Claims 51, 52, 55, 58-63 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell (WO 98/57180) in view of Wood et al. (6,670,607). Bell teaches a probe that heats a sample or reagent while in contact with the probe. The probe is best shown in Figures 1 and 2. The probe includes an inner structure (26), an outer structure (28), an insulator (30) and a connector (32) element. The inner structure define a probe lumen (38) for retaining a fluid. Current is passed from an electrical supply (14) through the inner and outer structures to heat the fluid (page 8, lines 6-20 and page 9, lines 1-23). Bell does not teach a plastic based electrically conductive material. Bell instead uses a conductive stainless steel element to form the probe (page

Application/Control Number: 10/001,762

Art Unit: 1743

10, line 9-15). Bell recites the electrical supply elements on page 12, line 22 through page 13, line 27 and includes a temperature regulating device.

Wood teaches a conductive polymer coated pipette tip used in electrospray.

The tip is shown in Figure 1 and described in column 6. The emitter tip (10) has a tapered body (12) with an inlet (14) and outlet (16) connected by a passage (18).

Adhered to the exterior of the tip is a PANI coating (19). Wood states that their emitter is an improvement over metal tip emitters because they provide long term durability and allow for examination of materials in the emitter since the coating and tip are transparent (column 3, lines 1-27). Wood also states that regular tips acquired in bulk from a supplier may have the coating added to them by merely dipping them into the polymer (col. 6, lines 43-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the tip of Wood with the probe of Bell. As stated by Wood, use of their tip instead of the steel tip of Wood would for the examination of materials in the probe. The use of Wood's probe would also allow for the use of disposable tips that would reduce the amount of cleaning required between multiple uses of the probe unit.

3. Claims 53, 56 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell and Wood as applied to claims 51, 52, 55, 58-63 and 66 above, and further in view of Matteson (4,697,451). Bell and Wood, as combined above, teach every element of claims 53, 56 and 64 except for the capacitive sensor for measuring volume. Matteson teaches an apparatus for measuring volume in a dispensing capillary via capacitive measurements. The device is best shown in Figure 1 and described in

Art Unit: 1743

column 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the volume measuring system and method of Matteson to the combined teachings of Bell and Wood. Bell already teaches a probe set up in which electrical signals and readings are used to control heat in the probe tip. One would add the teachings of Matteson to measure the volume of material in the probe.

Response to Arguments

4. The Examiner has removed all previous rejections in light of applicant's amendment submitted 9/02/2004. The Examiner has now provided new rejections based on newly submitted/discovered prior art however. For this reason, the Office Action has not been made final by the Examiner. The Examiner apologizes for the previous oversight.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claim 64 is allowed. In claim 64, applicant has claimed a method for tempering a specimen that includes use of a needle element. This feature was deemed allowable in the previous action.
- 6. Claim 57 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/001,762

Art Unit: 1743

Conclusion

Page 5

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Wiktor (6,232,129) teaches a piezoelectric pipette. Windolph (6,439,068) teaches a process for measuring liquid volume via capacitance measurements. Incavo (6,267,015) shows a device for sampling at elevated temperatures. Geiss et al. (5,287,758) teach a temperature controlled pipette tube.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dwayne K Handy whose telephone number is (571)-272-1259. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571)-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DKH

November 29, 2004

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700